A Short

DISSERTATION

Concerning the four last

Kings of Judah.

Occasioned by a small Tract, Intituled, *Josephi Scaligeri judicium de Thesi quadam Chronologica.*

And more especially,

By some passages in *Lud. Cappellus's* Notes upon the Twelfth Table of his *Chronologia Sacra.*

Licens'd, *Aug.* 12. 1689. *J. F.*

LONDON,

Printed for *Charles Brome,* at the *Gun,* at the West-end of St. *Paul's* Church-yard. 1689.

BIBLIOTHECA · BODLEIANA

A Short DISSERTATION Concerning the four last Kings of Judah.

Joseph Scaliger, amongst others, hath observed some difficulties in the History of the four last Kings of *Judah*, viz. *Jehoahaz*, *Jehoiakim*, *Jehoiakin*, and *Zedekiah*. Particularly, he doth this in a short Tract, Intituled, *Josephi Scaligeri judicium de thesi quadam Chronologica*, (which we have after his *Prolagomena* to his *Canones Isagogici*) in which he desires, that some studious person would undertake the solution of those difficulties. Many have since endeavour'd it, particularly *Lud. Cappellus*, in his Notes upon the twelfth Table of his *Chronologia Sacra*. There are sundry passages in those Notes relating to the Kings before-mention'd, which I could not but take more especial notice of; but I shall examine only two of them.

1. He asserts that *Jehoahaz* was the younger Brother of *Jehoiakim*, though he reign'd before him. See Note 7th.

2. He suspects, that when they began to Reign, *Jehoahaz* was but thirteen years old, and *Jehoiakim* only fifteen. So in Note 8th.

The Learned *Cappellus* was (it seems) so secure of the truth of that assertion, that *Jehoahaz* was the younger Brother, that he offers nothing at all in way of confirmation of it. But others have attempted to prove it by the arguments following; the validity of which we shall briefly examine.

Arg. 1. If *Jehoahaz* was not the younger Brother, why did they Anoint him, 2 *Kings*, 23. 30. for the eldest Sons of their Kings were not Anointed?

Answ. 1. It is not true, that none but the younger Sons were Anointed; *Jehoash* was not a younger Brother when he was Proclaimed King (for all his brethren were slain, at least, six years before, 2 *Kings*, 11. 1, 2, 3.) and yet he was Anointed, *v.* 12.

2. Suppose that they did not ordinarily Anoint the eldest, yet they did it in the case of *Jehoahaz*, that by this Solemnity they might confirm him in the Kingdom, in opposition to *Pharaoh-nechoh*, or any that he might obtrude upon them. Or by Anointing him they declar'd, That the Kingdom being disturb'd, by the Arms of the *Egyptian*, they deliver'd it to *Jehoahaz* (*tanquam de integro*) as it was a new.

Arg. 2. *Jehoahaz* was the same with *Shallum* mention'd, 1 *Chron.* 3. Now *Shallum* is there said to be the fourth Son of *Josiah*, and so he was, of necessity, younger Brother to *Jehoiakim*, who was *Josiahs* second Son (for 1 *Chron.* 3. 15. the Sons of *Josiah* are reckon'd thus, The first-born *Johanan*, the second *Jehoiakim*, the third *Zedekiah*, the fourth *Shallum*;) that *Jehoahaz* was *Shallum*, there mention'd, they think to be manifest from *Jer.* 22. 11.

Answ. That, which they say, is not manifest from *Jer.* 22. 1. It is not manifest that the *Shallum*, Jer. 22. was *Jehoahaz*.

2. If it was, yet it is not manifest that the *Shallum*, Jer. 22. was the same with the *Shallum* mention'd, 1 *Chron.* 3. Some think that by *Shallum*, Jer. 22. was meant *Jehoiakim*. *Flamin. Nobilius* tells us, that the 72, according to one Edition, have ὃν Ἰωαχὰμ instead of ὃν Σελλὰμ. It is probable that Ἰωαχὰμ being found in the Margin (some having set it there as an interpretation of Σελλὰμ) crept from thence into the Text. Others have interpreted the *Shallum*, Jer. 22. to be

be *Zedekiah*, for the Kingdom of *Judah* had an end, or was overthrown, when he was King. And ſo (ſay they) he was rightly nam'd *Shallum*, which ſignifies a conſummation or finiſhing. Of this opinion was *R. Solomon*; yea, it ſeems, by *R. Kimchi*, that this was the generally receiv'd opinion among the *Jewiſh* Doctors; ſee them both in *Jer.* 22. Finally, *Kimchi* himſelf was of opinion that *Shallum*, Jer. 22. was *Jehoiakim*. And I have not met with any *Jewiſh* Writer, that interprets *Shallum* to be *Jehoahaz*, but *Ab. Ezra*. So that from all this, we may conclude that it is not ſo manifeſt that *Shallum*, Jer. 22. was *Jehoahaz*, as ſome bear us in hand.

But 2dly. Suppoſe it was manifeſt that *Shallum*, in *Jer.* 22. was *Jehoahaz*, yet it is not manifeſt that that *Shallum* in *Jer.* 22. was the ſame with the *Shallum* mention'd *Chron.* 3. and ſo it appears not that *Jehoahaz* was that *Shallum*; eſpecially, if the *Hebrew* Writers, *ap. S. Hieron*, ſay truly that *Shallum* was a common name to all the Sons of *Joſiah*. Yea, it ſeems impoſſible that *Jehoahaz* ſhould be that *Shallum*. That *Shallum* was the fourth and youngeſt Son of *Joſiah*, and conſequently *Jehoahaz* (if he was that *Shallum*) was the younger Brother of *Zedekiah*, *Joſiahs* third, as well as of *Jehoiakim* the ſecond Son. Now it ſeems impoſſible that *Jehoahaz* ſhould be the younger Brother of *Zedekiah*, and muſt ſeem ſo to every one that compares their ages when they began to reign. *Jehoahaz* was twenty three years old when he began his reign, 2 *Kings*. 23. 31. when *Zedekiah* was only twenty one years of age, when he entred upon his, 2 *Kings*, 24. 18. and that was above eleven years after the beginning of *Jehoahaz's* reign; for *Jehoiakims* eleven years reign was between theirs. See 2 *Kings*, 23. 36. Now is it poſſible, that he who was twenty three years old, ſhould be the younger Brother of one that was but twenty one years old above eleven years after? Could *Hamutal* bring forth the elder Brother thirteen years after that ſhe was deliver'd of the younger? *Scaliger* acknowledges this to be a difficulty which he could not aſſoil, but wiſhes others to do it for him (*Quærent ſtudioſi*, ſo he.) Let us ſee then how others have endeavour'd to ſolve it.

1. Some

1. Some ſay that the *Shallum*, 1 *Chron.* 3. was indeed *Joſiahs* third Son, and elder than *Zedekiah*. It is true, he is call'd the fourth, but (ſay they) that is not in reſpect of age, but becauſe of the ſhortneſs of his reign, his unworthy demeanour in it. But this needs no confutation, *Scaliger* himſelf calls it *futilis ſolutio*.

2. Others ſay that *Zedekiah* was made King while his Father liv'd, and reigned together with him three years. And that when 'tis ſaid that he was twenty one years old when he began to reign, the meaning is, When he began to reign with his Father three years before his death; at which time *Jehoahaz* was only twenty years of age, and conſequently younger than *Zedekiah* by one year.

But 1. The ſenſe of the Text, 2 *Kings.* 24. 1. is plainly that *Zedekiah* was but the age of twenty one years when he was made King by *Nabuchadnezzar*, *Jehoiakim* being carry'd Captive to *Babylon*.

2. How appears it that *Zedekiah* ever reign'd with his Father? It is a thing ſo improbable in it ſelf, that *Joſiah* ſhould paſs by the other, and take his third Son to reign with him, that it requires very good proof. And yet all the proof that is offer'd is from *Jer.* 27. 1, 2, 3. where we read, that in the beginning of the reign of *Jehoiakim*, the Prophet was commanded to prepare Bonds and Yokes, and to ſend them to certain Kings, by the hands of the Ambaſſadors that came to *Jeruſalem* to *Zedekiah* King of *Judah*. The neighbouring Kings who had underſtood that *Zedekiah* was made King three years before his Fathers Death, did think that he reign'd ſtill after his Fathers deceaſe, and ſo ſent their Ambaſſadors to him. Thus *Ab. Ezra* in *Dan.* 1. But this Interpretation is manifeſtly very far fetch'd, and therefore much time needs not be ſpent in the examination of it.. All the ſtreſs lyes upon this, That Ambaſſadors were ſent unto *Zedekiah* as King of *Judah*, in the beginning of the reign of *Jehoiakim*, which cannot be proved from that Text. Some have thought that when 'tis ſaid, In the beginning of the reign of *Jehoiakim*, v. 1. *Jehoiakim*, by the Scribes negligence, hath crept into the Text inſtead of *Zedekiah*. Or however that, by *Jehoiakim* we are to underſtand *Zedekiah*, for they ſay that

Jehoiakim

Jehoiakim was a common name to all the Sons of *Josiah*. S. *Hieron* was of opinion, That that *v.* 1. belongs to the foregoing Chapter, *viz.* The twenty sixth, and in no wise to that which follows in chap. 27. As he also observes, that it was not found in the Copies of the 72, which they had then, as it is wanting in some Editions of that Translation now. But I shall wave all this, and suppose that the contents of the former part of chap. 27, were deliver'd to the Prophet in the beginning of *Jehoiakim*'s reign, yet it will not follow that Ambassadors were sent to *Zedekiah*, as King of *Judah*, at that time. For 1. That might be given in charge to the Prophet, in the time of *Jehoiakim*, which he was not to execute till the reign of *Zedekiah*. He might receive a command in the time of the one, what he should do and say in the reign of the other; see *v.* 12. of that chap. 27. 2. Some have thought that the Prophet did then presently execute some part of that which was given him in charge, *i. e.* He did put the Bonds and Yokes upon his Neck, and did carry them (tho' not constantly, yet at certain times) during the reigns of *Jehoiakim* and *Jehoiakin*, and to the fourth year of *Zedekiah*; even fifteen years (says *R. Solom.* in *Loc.*) till *Hananiah* broke them from his Neck, *Jer.* 28. 10. I cannot dismiss this Interpretation without remarking that *Kimchi* takes notice of it, and expressly alledges *Ab. Ezra* for it; and yet doth not assent to it, but gives a quite other expofition of *Jer.* 27. 1, 2, 3. as well as *R. Solom.* doth.

3. Some think to Solve the aforesaid difficulty, by saying that the *Zedekiah* who succeeded *Jehoiakin*, and was then only of the age of twenty one years, was the *Zedekiah* mention'd in 1 *Chron.* 3. 16. (where we read the Sons of *Jehoiakim*, *Jeconiah* his Son, *Zedekiah* his Son) and not *Zedekiah* the Son of *Josiah*, spoken of *v.* 15. That he were *Zedekiah* mention'd *v.* 16. they prove from 2 *Chron.* 36. 10. where he is call'd the Brother of *Jehoiakin*. But to this the answer is easie, it being known and acknowledg'd that the word Brother, in Holy Writ, is taken very frequently in a larger sense, *viz.* for any Kinsman. Thus the *Zedekiah*, who succeeded *Jehoiakin*, was his Brother, *i. e.* his near Kinsman, for he was indeed his Unkle or Fathers Brother. We have sufficient

ent warrant for this Interpretation from 2 *Kings*, 24.17. where this *Zedekiah* is expreſly call'd his Fathers Brother; yea, the ſeventy two and Syr. (not to mention the Vulg.) read not his Brother, but his Unkle or Fathers Brother, even in 2 *Chron.* 36. 10. Beſides, if this *Zedekiah* was the *Zedekiah* mention'd 1 *Chron.* 3, 16. and the Brother of *Jehoiakin* (as theſe men pretend) they will acknowledge that he was his younger Brother, and then (unleſs they will admit a vacancy or interregnum of three or four years, betwixt *Jehoiakin* and *Zedekiah*) he could not be twenty one years old when he began his reign; for *Jehoiakin* was but eighteen years old when he began to reign, 2 *Kings*, 24. 8. and reign'd only three months and ten days. Add hereto, that the *Zedekiah* which ſucceeded *Jehoiakin* was the Son of *Hamutal*, 2 *Kings*, 24. 17. that *Hamutal* undoubtedly, which was the Mother of *Jehoahaz*, 2 *Kings*, 23. 31. Finally, can words expreſs more clearly what *Zedekiah* it was that reign'd after *Jehoiakin* or *Coniah*, than thoſe do *Jer.* 37. 1? And King *Zedekiah*, the Son of *Joſiah*, reign'd inſtead of *Coniah* the Son of *Jehoiakim*.

Arg. 3. *Jehoahaz* was only twenty three years old when he began his reign, 2 *Kings*, 23. 31. and but three months after, we find *Jehoiakim* to have been twenty five years old, 2 *Kings*, 23. 31, 36. therefore *Jehoiakim* was elder than *Jehoahaz*.

Anſw. It doth not appear that *Jehoiakim* was ſo old three months after that *Jehoahaz* began his reign. *Jehoiakim* was twenty five years old when he began to reign, *i. e.* (ſay ſome) when he began to reign in his own right, which he could not do until his Brother *Jehoahaz* was dead. But ſuppoſe we grant that thoſe words, When we began to reign, do refer to the time when he was firſt made King by *Pharaoh nechoh*, there might be an interval of time between *Nechohs* removing *Jehoahaz*, and ſubſtituting *Jehoiakim* in his place. When he had remov'd *Jehoahaz* from the Kingdom, he either took him along with him from *Jeruſalem* to *Riblah*, or ſent for him thither. *Riblah*, according to St. *Hieron.* in *Ezek.* 47. was *Antioch* in *Syria*, and accordingly the *Targ. Jonath.* and *Jeruſ.* in *Num.* 34. 11. interpret *Riblah* to be *Daphne*; as alſo others tell us, that *Antioch* was built out of the ruins of an ancient

City

City call'd *Riblah*. Now *Antioch* was at a considerable distance from *Jerusalem*, and a proportionable time must be allow'd for *Jehoahaz*'s journey from *Jerusalem* thither, and the same time (if not more) for *Nechoch*'s march from thence to *Judea*, to order the affairs of the Country; also some time for the settling those affairs (and how long he might stay at *Riblah* after *Jehoahaz*'s coming thither we know not.) All this may make it reasonable to believe, that a considerable space of time did intervene between *Jehoahaz*'s removal from, and *Jehoiakims* entrance upon the Kingdom, which is mentioned only after *Jehoahaz*'s being bound in *Riblah*, and the settling the Tribute in *Judea*: See 2 *Kings*, 23. 33, 34. The Thesis of which, *Scaliger* gives his judgment in the small Tract before-mention'd, is this, That between the end of *Jehoahaz*'s reign, and the beginning of *Jehoiakims*, there interven'd the space of two years more or less. This position he endeavours to overthrow by sundry arguments, but the answering them will not require much time or pains. In the first, he only begs the thing in question, *viz.* That after that *Jehoahaz* had continu'd three months in the Kingdom, *Nechoh* presently appointed *Jehoiakim* to succeed. The third and fourth Arguments depends upon this, That there must be a Septenary number of years between *Hezekiahs* fourteenth year, and the destruction of the Temple; as also between *Moses*'s death and the destruction of it. To us therefore, who acknowledge no necessity of a Septenary number of years, these arguments signifie as little as the first. His second Argument only remains, which is this: The fourth year of *Jehoiakim* was the twenty third from the thirteenth of *Josiah*, Jer. 25. 1, 3. from which, to the beginning of the reign of *Jehoahaz*, were nineteen compleat years; from thence, to the beginning of the fourth year of *Jehoiakim*, compleat three years; and so from the thirteenth of *Josiah*, to the beginning of *Jehoiakims* fourth year, were twenty two compleat; therefore the twenty third year, *Jer.* 25. was only current. But if an interregnum of two years had interven'd, it had not been the twenty third year but the twenty fifth: thus he. For answer, *Scaliger* tells us not what ground he had to reckon compleat nineteen years, from the thirteenth of *Josiah*

to the beginning of the reign of *Jehoahaz*. *Josiah* reign'd 31 years; substract 13 out of 31, and there remains 18. Reckon then 18 years to the beginning of *Jehoahaz*'s reign; two from the beginning of his to the beginning of *Jehoiakims*, and then (as *Scaliger* himself computes) three years to the beginning of *Jehoiakims* fourth year, and you have exactly the number of twenty three years, according to *Jer.* 25. I only add, that though *Scaliger* would by no means allow of any Interregnum between *Jehoahaz* and *Jehoiakim*, yet the learned *Cappellus* was not so averse from admitting one: For he allots a whole year to *Jehoahaz*, although the Scripture says that he reign'd only three months, *viz.* He conceiv'd that there was a vacancy or interregnum of nine months.

Having thus examined the Arguments that are brought to support *Cappellus*'s assertion, I shall now propose one or two on the other side, to prove that *Jehoahaz* was the elder Brother.

Arg. 1. If *Jehoahaz* was the same with *Johanan*, then he was certainly the elder Brother, for of *Johanan* it is said expressly, 1 *Chron.* 3. 15. that he was the first born. Some say that he is call'd the first born, not in respect of birth but of dignity, because he was thought most worthy to succeed his Father in the Kingdom. But this needs no confutation; or, if it did, *Tostatus* in 1 *Chron.* 3. hath refuted it sufficiently. As to *Jehoahaz*'s being the same with *Johanan*, a late writer says that all Commentators are agreed in it. But I must not say that, partly because I have not consulted all Commentators as (it seems) that Author hath, partly because I have met with sundry Commentators that are of a different opinion. Yet I could easily produce several very judicious Expositors, both Christian and Jewish, that have thought *Jehoahaz* to be *Johanan*. But I shall rather chuse to prove it by this plain argument, *Jehoahaz* being the son of *Josiah*, must of necessity be either *Johanan* or *Shallum* (this *Scaliger* urgeth); but it hath been prov'd above, that he could not be *Shallum*, and so he must be *Johanan*.

Arg. 2. He that succeeds his Father in the Kingdom, should by the Law of Nations be the eldest son (this *Scaliger* grants) but *Jehoahaz* succeeded his Father in the Kingdom.

Having

Having thus conſidered the arguments on both ſides, as diligently and impartially as I can, I judge it moſt agreeable to the Scripture-hiſtory, to ſay that *Jehoahaz* was the eldeſt ſon of *Joſiah*, as being the ſame with *Johanan*. All the difficulty that this puts us upon, is, The admitting an Interregnum of a year and nine months between the end of *Jehoahaz*'s three months, and the beginning of the reign of *Jehoiakim*; or of not ſo much, if *Jehoahaz*'s twenty three years, 2 *Kings*, 23. 31. were compleat, and *Jehoiakims* twenty fifth year, *v.* 36. was only current. This ſeems to me not comparable to the inſupportable difficulties that attend the other opinion.

The ſecond paſſage in the Learned *Cappellus*, which we ſhall examine (but more briefly) is this: When *Jehoahaz* is ſaid to to be twenty three years old, and *Jehoiakim* twenty five, he ſuſpects that thirteen ſhould be read inſtead of twenty three, and fifteen inſtead of twenty five. His reaſon is, becauſe if *Jehoiakim* had been twenty five years old when he began to reign, he muſt have been born when his Father was but fifteen years of age, and conceiv'd when he was but fourteen; accordingly, if *Jehoahaz* had been twenty three years of age, his Father muſt have been only of the age of ſixteen when he was born. Now it ſeemed to him very inconſiſtent with *Joſiahs* piety, to begin to beget Children ſo ſoon.

Anſw. 1. I cannot but judge it very agreeable to that good Kings Piety, to make uſe of the proper remedy againſt means to ſubdue youthful Luſts. Some have believ'd that *Solomon* was neither fifteen nor fourteen years of age when he begat *Reboboam*; whether they had firm grounds for their belief I ſhall not diſpute; ſee *St. Hieron. epiſt. ad Vitale*. 2. *Cappellus* in ſaying that *Joſiah* was but fourteen years old when he begat *Jehoiakim*, proceeds upon his former miſtake, that *Jehoiakim* was elder than *Jehoahaz*; but according to our Hypotheſis, *Jehoiakim* was not conceived till *Joſiahs* fifteenth year, or the beginning of his ſixteenth.

F I N I S.